

such a circumstance, it would be advantageous to power only a small section of the display panel sufficient in size for displaying information relevant to the operation of the cellular telephone such as the telephone number or battery indicator. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 5 to point out particularly that Applicant's information device is capable of behaving as two separate devices, namely a "cellular communications device" and a "personal digital assistant."

This is not taught in Shimada. Specifically, in Shimada, a single image relevant to the same device, such as a computing device, is scaled and re-rastered onto a portion of the display screen (the so-called "reduced" mode). In the reduced mode, the image displayed when the entire display panel is active is scaled down in size and then re-displayed onto a reduced area of the display panel. By contrast, Applicant's invention, as detailed in the amended claims, has a cellular communications function which is visible on the second set of sub-panels while the first set of sub-panels is powered down (claims 1 and 2). Likewise, claim 5, relating to an embodiment where two separate display panels are provided, has been amended to point out that one of the display panels can be powered down allowing the other display panel to continue displaying information about the cellular communications function.

Since these features are not in Shimada, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 have been overcome and that these rejections be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,414,444 issued to Britz ("Britz").

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 11 to point out specifically that Applicant's invention in one embodiment envisions a dual-function information device. Specifically, when the latch is closed on the device, information relevant to a cellular communications function is displayed, while when the latch is open information relevant to either one of or both a cellular communications device and a personal digital assistant is displayed. Britz does not teach or suggest such a feature. As mentioned above, Shimada does not teach such a dual-function information device. Therefore, the combination of Shimada and Britz do not teach or suggest the invention as recited in amended claims 8 and 11.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Britz, further in view of U.S. Patent 5,218,399 issued to Isumi et al. ("Isumi").

Isumi does teach a system with two separate display panels but is intended to included two types of displays, namely a dot matrix display and a segment display such as in an LCD, for one particular function such as a camera. In Isumi, the camera has an ON state and an OFF state, such that one display panel is used in the ON state and the other is used in the OFF state to govern

consumption of power. By contrast, Applicant's display panel system is intended to allow the display of information relevant to separate functions, such as a cellular communications device and a PDA on similar type display panels, namely LCD or segment drive panels. Isumi teaches away from such a system in that the two panels are used for the same function and not for separate functions. Further, Isumi does not mention or suggest an information device that is capable of either functionality (cellular communications or PDA) as does Applicant's invention. Since Shimada and Britz also do not teach or suggest the features of claims 11-12, the combination of these three references do not yield Applicant's invention. Applicant has canceled claim 13 based on the substantial amendment made to its parent claim 11, and thus the rejection of claim 13 is rendered moot.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome and that these rejections be withdrawn.

For these and other reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome and requests that they be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: _____

1/30/98


Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California
90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on January 30, 1998.

Nedy Calderon
Nedy Calderon

1/30/98

Date